DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 061 IR 008 538

AUTHOR Heinich, Robert
TITLE Report of Second Annual Survey of the Circulation of Educational Media in Public Schools, 1978-1979.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audiovisual Aids: Budgeting: Cataloging: *Educational Media: *Library Circulation: Nonprint Media: *Public Schools: *School Surveys: Statistical Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Controversial Materials

ABSTRACT

This report presents responses to a questionnaire regarding circulation of educational media in public schools from 76 school districts, 42 counties, and 57 regional and cooperative agencies, with a special section on controversial materials. The survey presents budgeting information by sources; profiles of collections: circulation of videotapes: catalog organization: information supplied by agency catalogs: catalog annotations and their content, sources, and revisions: catalog contents, subject classification, revision, and distribution: and the use of common computer bases for catalog generation. Responses to questions on controversial materials cover administrative approval, separate cataloging, challenges to collections, frequency of challenged items, and geographic distribution of challenges. (RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190061

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REPORT OF SECOND ANNUAL SURVEY OF THE CIRCULATION OF EDUCATIONAL MEDIA IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1978- 1979

by

Robert Heinich

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Heinich

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR008538

REPORT OF SECOND ANNUAL SURVEY OF THE

CIRCULATION OF EDUCATIONAL MEDIA IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1978-79

Robert Heinich, Media Studies Office
Audio-Visual Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

with the assistance of
Ju Kang and Doris Brodeur

Participants in the Second Annual Survey were: 76 school districts, 42 counties, and 57 regional or cooperative agencies.

Table 1. Breakdown of Respondents by ADA or ADM

ADA	0-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-39,999	40,000-64,999	65,000-99,999	100,000-249,999	250,000+	Total	% of Sample
School District	16	18	20	13	4	3	2	76	43.4%
County	4	7	9	6	8	6	2	42	24%
Regional (+State)	3	8	9	7	11	16	3	57	32.6%

This year's report does not include a breakdown of the number of schools served. As we mentioned in the information sent out with the first survey, some data will be reported on a cyclical basis. We will include a tabulation of types of schools served in the report of the Third Annual Survey.

Questions 4 and 5 of survey -- Percentage of total budget and materials budget due to indicated sources. (Table 2)

We debated whether to report the responses to questions 4 and 5 because the data seem unreliable in certain aspects. For example, it is hard to believe that the percentages of sources of support of Counties should fluctuate so much <u>across ADA categories</u>. The data may not have been reported accurately. But perhaps our sample introduces a bias,

Table 2. Sources of Funds (in percentages)

Sources	ADA	0-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-39,999	40,000-64,999	65,000-99,999	100,000-249,999	250,000+	N responses to item
District		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
local funds									
total budget	range	10-100	0-100	30-100	20-93	10-100	30-55	30-55	67
	mean	63.7	62.6	62.9	66.7	51.3	42.5	42.5	
materials budget	range	5-100	0-100	0-100	20-93	0-100	19-90	19-90	63
	mean	65.1	64.2	60.4	60.6	58.8	54.7	54.7	
state funds									
total budget	range	0-64	0-90	0-65	0-66	0-75	30-38	30-38	?
	mean	?	28.8	25.7	21	37.5	34	34	
materials budget	range	0-56	0-90	0-90	0-70	0-75	10-25	10-25	63
	mean	15.6	22.8	18.8	22.7	32.5	20	20	
federal funds									
total budget	range	0-70	0-75	0-50	1-40	0-30	15-32	15-32	67
	mean	12.2	7.7	10.7	12.2	11.3	23.5	23.5	
materials budget	range	0-95	0-75	0-100	2-42	0-25	0-56	0-56	63
	mean	19.6	12.6	20.2	16.7	8.8	25.3	25.3	
County									
local funds									
total budget	range	0-100	0-84	0-90	20-100	0-50	0-33	32-99	39
	mean	57.3	19	19.9	77	16.8	13.5	65.5	
materials budget	range	0-100	0-94	0-90	99-100	0-80	0-95	70-95	34
	mean	54.8	18.8	28.2	99.5	24.3	31.7	82.5	
fees for service									
total budget	range	0	0-100	0-100	0-53	0-100	50-100	1-50	39
	mean	0	44.2	73.4	11.6	61	71.8	25.5	
materials budget	range	0	0-100	0-100	0-1	0-100	0-100	4-5	33
	mean	0	39	66.7	.3	55.1	59.5	4.5	
state funds									
total budget	range	0-40	0-100	0-30	0-29	0-52	0-27	0-10	39
	mean	10	35.5	5.1	11.4	21.1	13.3	5	
materials budget	range	0-40	0-100	0-10	0	0-52	0-27	0-1	33
	mean	10	40.6	1.7	0	18.1	6.2	.5	

Table 2 (cont.)

	ADA	0-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-39,999	40,000-64,999	65,000-99,999	100,000-249,999	250,000+	N responses to item
County (cont.)									
federal funds									
total budget	range	0-100	0-5	0-7	0-1	0-7	0-5	0-8	39
	mean	32.8	1.3	1.6	.2	1.1	1.5	4	
materials budget	range	0-100	0-5	0-21	0-1	0-10	0-11	0-25	34
	mean	35.3	1.3	3.5	.3	2.4	2.8	12.5	
Regional									
local funds									
total budget	range	0-25	0-100	0-100	0-75	0-85	0-99	0-25	56
	mean	8.3	34.9	31.8	10.7	11.4	15.6	8.3	
materials budget	range	0-50	0-100	0-100	0-75	0-98	0-100	0-25	56
	mean	16.7	31.9	37.8	10.7	8.9	10.1	8.3	
fees for service									
total budget	range	0-100	0-100	0-100	0-100	15-100	0-100	0-75	56
	mean	44.3	19.8	45.6	67.6	54.7	42.1	49.7	
materials budget	range	0-100	0-100	0-100	0-100	0-100	0-100	0-75	56
	mean	41.7	18.8	16.6	68.1	39	43.8	45	
state funds									
total budget	range	0-100	0-70	0-57	0-27	0-66	0-100	0-95	56
	mean	46.7	12.8	10.5	12.4	27.9	26.9	37.7	
materials budget	range	0-100	0-75	0-80	0-25	0-100	0-100	0-95	56
	mean	41	12.8	19.7	3.6	40.6	28.7	45	
federal funds									
total budget	range	0-2	0-100	0-75	0-33	0-67	0-100	0-8	56
	mean	.7	30.1	12.1	9.3	10.6	15.5	4.3	
materials budget	range	0-2	0-100	0-75	0-80	0-84	0-100	0-5	56
	mean	.7	36.6	16	17.6	11.5	17.4	1.7	

i. e. the counties we chose to represent some ADA categories are in states that have very high or very low state support. We will look into that. In any event, it would help us and the field if care is taken to report accurate data. We realize that these particular questions require digging but the information is very important.

The right-hand column in Table 2 shows the number of agencies that responded to the item.

Questions 6, 7, 8 -- Number of prints and titles of films and number of <u>new</u> titles purchased. (Table 3)

These data are reported a little differently this time. We are reporting means only. The ADA breakdowns may be more useful in determining where your program stands.

Questions 9, 10, 11 -- Concerning the circulation of videotapes and the sources of program material. (Table 4)

We plan to ask these questions every year in order to detect trends in an important area of medium format. Both agencies and commercial distributors need to know when a new format is making significant inroads on the distribution and, therefore, collection of a traditional format. As of 1978-79, 57% of districts, 40% of counties, and 53% of regionals distribute program material in some videotape format.

From the section on sources of programing, it can be seen that agencies that do circulate videotaped programs get those programs from a variety of sources. The pattern of differences in sources is most striking in that districts rely more on recordings of broadcast material and on local production (anticipated) than do counties and regionals, and that regionals are leading the way in videotaping 16mm films under licensing agreements.

Table 3. Profile of Collections (means)

	ADA	0-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-39,999	40,000-64,999	65,000-99,999	100,000-249,999	250,000+	N responses to item
	Agency								
Prints	District	647	1,486.2	2,496.7	5,009.7	6,243.7	11,007.7	19,776	66
	County	1,288.3	1,521	2,644.4	5,368.3	7,774.3	10,914.7	29,451	37
	Regional	2,391	1,775.9	2,439.9	3,009.5	4,628.8	8,133.3	8,794.7	51
Titles	District	672.2	1,376.6	1,966.3	3,123.8	3,514.3	5,112	2,519	68
	County	1,237.3	1,444	2,050.3	3,424.3	3,870.3	3,279.8	8,730.5	37
	Regional	1,626	1,598.6	2,057.2	2,1[illegible]4.8	3,045.9	3,788.9	5,000	51
Largest Number of Prints per Title	District	2.2	2.6	4.7	10.3	5.8	23.7	10	75
	County	2.5	2.8	4.4	6.2	9.5	21.5	28.5	41
	Regional	4.3	3.3	3.2	4.4	7.3	11.7	12	57
Bookings	District	2,274.5	10,257.1	22,287.4	35,238.1	58,853	80,530	251,206	61
	County	6,361.5	4,313.5	20,042.7	54,061.2	75,802	106,622.7	125,990	36
	Regional	13,745.5	9,268	23,723.4	24,546.6	51,959.8	74,748.6	80,269	47
Requests	District	2,203.1	9,726.5	24,047.8	49,453.5	72,844	100,876.3	342,745	50
	County	8,199.3	4,645	25,754.3	61,331.8	82,080.4	116,964.7	153,753	33
	Regional	14,268.5	9,648.5	28,735	31,599.3	60,396.3	98,747	137,905	44
Booking/Request Ratio	District	.93	.93	.88	.80	.82	.80	.69	47
	County	.86	.99	.89	.89	.89	.92	.82	31
	Regional	.98	.96	.93	.77	.80	.77	.71	43
Print/Title Ratio	District	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.6	1.8	2.3	7.9	47
	County	1.1	1.04	1.3	1.5	2.1	3.2	4.2	31
	Regional	1.5	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.6	2.2	1.5	43
Request/Elementary Ratio	District	341.2	636.2	758.2	894.1	769.4	831.4	835.8	47
	County	432.3	330.7	627.1	911.3	1,071.6	866.4	469.4	31
	Regional	263.0	380.8	595.5	469.7	552.8	503.4	106.0	42

Table 3 (cont.)

	ADA	0-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-39,999	40,000-64,999	65,000-99,999	100,000-249,999	250,000+	N responses to item
	Agency								
Print/Elementary Ratio	District	93.5	84.9	86.4	86.5	66.4	91.3	45.6	47
	County	79.4	84.5	69.4	78.5	96.2	83.0	75.2	31
	Regional	37.0	67.3	51.9	42.1	41.8	43.9	6.5	42
New Film Titles	District	48.3	135.5	92.6	151.6	173.3	302.7	200	71
	County	50.5	95.5	130.3	234.6	220.3	182	292.5	41
	Regional	89.3	138.6	120.6	62.1	172.6	198.8	187	52

Table 4. Circulation of Videotapes

	District			County			Regional		
	n[a]	%	n[b] responses to item	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item
Percent circulating video materials	43	57%	76	16	40%	40	30	53%	57
Number of titles range	5-2800		35	1-375		12	2-800		24
mean	258.9			82.2			196.3		
Percent obtaining materials	Of the 43 agencies who circulate video mat'ls:			Of the 16 agencies who circulate video mat'ls:			Of the 30 agencies who circulate video mat'ls:		
from legal recordings of 16mm film	8	19%		4	25%		12	40%	
purchased or leased from commercial distributors	21	49%		5	31%		12	40%	
purchased or leased from non-profit distributors	22	51%		7	44%		17	57%	
from rental	3	7%		1	6%		0	0	
from broadcasts by commercial stations	5	12%		1	6%		0	0	
from broadcasts by public stations	29	67%		5	31%		13	43%	
from local production	34	79%		11	69%		16	55%	
Formats being circulated:									
U-matic	37	86%		14	88%		26	87%	
½" cassette	12	28%		3	19%		5	17%	
2" open-reel	0	0		0	0		0	0	
1" open-reel	2	5%		0	0		1	3%	
½" open-reel	21	49%		11	69%		16	53%	
Decision to adopt a single format (Yes responses)	36	56%	64	8	28%	29	16	33%	48
Choice of single format	Of the 33[c] agencies choosing single format:			Of the 8 agencies choosing single format:			Of the 16 agencies choosing single format:		
U-matic	22	67%		6	75%		13	81%	
½" cassette	10	28%		2	25%		3	19%	
½" open-reel	1	3%		0	0		0	0	

[a] n means the number engaging in the activity.
[b] The number of total responses to item.
[c] 3 with missing data.

The "½" cassette" response to choice of single format leaned toward Betamax. However, the VHS system was new when the question was asked. VHS is being touted by many to be the videotape format of the future. (See EPIE Report 89E, Summer 1979.) We are asking the question again this year to see if VHS is gaining the kind of acceptance predicted.

Questions 12, 13, 14, 15 are summarized in Table 5. Question 12 asked if the agency published one catalog listing all media distributed by the agency. If so, question 13 asked for the media included in the catalog. If not, respondents indicated the basis of organization of the catalogs.

Responses to question 13 can be used as a measure of how many agencies in each category distribute the specific media listed in the table. As indicated in the first survey, districts distribute a wider variety of media than counties or regionals.

We expected school districts to target their catalogs more frequently than counties or regionals. We assumed that the opportunity for closer curriculum coordination within a single district would be manifested in a cataloging system that would be tied more closely to curricular organization, particularly in elementary and junior high (or middle) school. Obviously, the majority of agencies publish one catalog and the favored method of indexing is by subject heading. Of the minority that publish more than one catalog, a solid majority publish separate catalogs of media or groups of media. Overall the preferred system of cataloging would seem to be by incorporating all items of media (whether in one or separate catalogs) for all grade levels and subjects in the same catalog.

We asked if items other than those listed in Table 5 were included in catalogs. The following are the responses in the "other" category:

Table 5. Catalog Organization

	Percentage Answering Yes								
	District			County			Regional		
	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item
One catalog for all media	50	66%	76	34	81%	41	36	63%	57
Media included in catalog:	Of 50 with 1 catalog:			Of 34 with 1 catalog:			Of 36 with 1 catalog:		
16mm films	49	98%		34	100%		36	100%	
8mm films	17	34%		9	26%		7	19%	
prerecorded videotape	23	46%		7	21%		19	53%	
filmstrips	35	70%		11	32%		23	64%	
slides and/or slide sets	33	66%		10	29%		15	42%	
overhead transparencies	29	58%		5	15%		17	47%	
masters for overheads	18	36%		4	12%		11	31%	
audio recordings	29	59%		9	26%		17	47%	
study prints	22	44%		5	15%		11	31%	
charts	15	30%		7	12%		7	19%	
realia and models	22	44%		10	29%		8	22%	
kits	32	64%		8	24%		16	44%	
games	13	26%		2	6%		7	19%	
Publish separate catalogs	26	34%	76	8	19%	41	21	37%	57
Basis of organization of separate catalogs	Of 26 with separate catalogs:			Of 8 with separate catalogs:			Of 21 with separate catalogs:		
medium or groups of media	16	62%		5	63%		17	80%	
grade level (e.g., K-3)	2	8%		1	13%		4	19%	
school level (e.g., elementary)	7	27%		1	13%		3	14%	
subject area (e.g., science)	7	27%		1	13%		4	19%	
school level and subject area (e.g., elementary science)	3	12%		1	13%		2	10%	

	District	County	Regional
Media included in <u>one</u> catalog	professional books	equipment	film loops
Other	work sheets discs suppl. reading sets bulletin board displays periodicals library books textbooks field trips learning resource units art prints (framed) sculpture	art prints mounted specimens specialized items	maps professional books life-size nursing aids professional AV materials EPIE reports special education collection services

Question 15 asked for identification of separate catalogs for individual media or groups of media. An opportunity was provided for "other" media for which catalogs are published. The following were listed:

	District	County	Regional
Separate catalogs by media	ed'l research on microfiche	professional lib.	art replicas
Other	in-house catalog equipment guide sculpture & art prints captioned film teacher-training film	examination collection	audio-tutorial mat'ls multimedia voc. ed./spec. ed./reading

Question 16 asked for agencies to indicate which items of information are in their catalogs (Table 6). Because of the length of this question, only the data for film, filmstrip, and audio recordings are shown. It is interesting that in this question our assumption about the district catalogs being more curricular oriented is borne out somewhat by the response to the item "curricular use or unit". District response to this item is significantly different from county or regional. Perhaps because the counties and

Table 6. Information Supplied by Catalog

Type of media and information	Approximate Percentage of Agencies Supplying Information		
	District mean	County mean	Regional mean
Films			
title	100%	100%	100%
booking or call number	93%	98%	92%
producer/distributor	84%	86%	87%
release or copyright date	60%	65%	67%
annotation	86%	100%	92%
sound/silent	66%	52%	65%
color/black and white	97%	83%	95%
running time	96%	100%	95%
curricular use or unit	56%	27%	23%
recommended grade level	95%	95%	89%
general subject area	86%	85%	82%
catalog subject heading (tracing)	53%	47%	62%
teacher's guide available	26%	28%	21%
Filmstrips			
title	100%	100%	100%
booking or call number	83%	83%	94%
producer/distributor	74%	81%	78%
release or copyright date	39%	69%	48%
annotation	35%	89%	84%
sound/silent	56%	47%	57%
color/black and white	60%	53%	50%
running time	21%	39%	54%
number of frames	40%	61%	51%
audio recording format	44%	53%	25%
signal: audible/inaudible	46%	28%	13%
curricular use or unit	41%	14%	2%
recommended grade level	93%	100%	76%
general subject area	89%	89%	76%
catalog subject heading (tracing)	48%	50%	52%
teacher's guide available	44%	53%	40%
Audio Recordings			
title	100%	100%	100%
booking or call number	82%	71%	97%
producer/distributor	71%	93%	56%
release or copyright date	45%	71%	32%
annotation	35%	71%	83%
running time	38%	57%	35%
number of items	19%	21%	20%
audio recording format	65%	71%	55%
curricular use or unit	43%	29%	2%
recommended grade level	86%	86%	86%
general subject area	81%	64%	77%
catalog subject heading (tracing)	36%	43%	49%
teacher's guide available	40%	29%	26%

regionals serve more than one district, they don't presume to specify curricular use (even though the curricula of those districts, particularly in elementary and junior high (or middle) school are probably very much the same).

To distribute or not to distribute a teacher's guide is an eternal problem. Probably everyone wants to but doing so simply is not compatible with the "system". Even if the logistics of getting the guide sent out with the film are mastered, the odds are they won't come back together -- and the guide may never make it back. Sales representatives must find it frustrating that a guide is insisted upon but then rarely used. Even the practice of adhering a simplified guide to the inside of the film can cover doesn't always work. In a high school, a film can come in, be used, shipped back without the teacher ever laying a hand on can or film. We have also seen the wrong guide in the cover of the film can! Notice that a significantly higher percentage of all three types of agency mention that guides are available for filmstrips than for films. Because they are all kept in the box?

Question 17 asked about what was included in "annotations." Table 7 summarizes the responses.

Surprisingly few respondents include utilization information (beyond description of content) in their annotations. The following are some examples of the kind of utilization information included by those who do so.

District: specific curricular use (more possible with districts than with counties and regionals which serve more than one district); restrictions as to use; sensitive teaching strategy needed (sometimes included); values clarification; good for creative writing.

County: reference to another item in collection.

Table 7. Catalog Annotations

	Percentage Answering Yes								
	District			County			Regional		
	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item
Annotations include:			73			42			57
synopsis of content	70	96%		41	98%		57	100%	
utilization information	6	8%		3	7%		7	12%	
cautions on controversial materials	35	48%		22	52%		26	46%	
"datedness" of content	8	11%		6	14%		7	12%	
specialized equipment needed	5	7%		3	7%		3	5%	
special conditions for use	3	4%		3	7%		2	4%	

Table 8. Source of Annotations

			72			42			57
Written by staff	55	76%		28	67%		41	72%	
From distributor's literature	61	85%		36	86%		55	97%	
From L. C. cards	15	21%		5	12%		9	16%	
From EFLA	6	8%		5	12%		12	21%	
From Chi Corporation	0	0		3	7%		2	4%	
From NICEM	26	36%		21	50%		18	32%	
From OCLC	2	3%		0	0		0	0	
From journal reviews/announcements	20	28%		13	31%		21	37%	

Table 9. Revision of Annotations

Annotations are reviewed and rewritten	56	77%	73	32	76%	42	51	89%	57
user initiated	30	54%		27	84%	32	40	78%	51
staff initiated	34	61%		23	72%	32	41	80%	51

Regional: open ended discussion films; value to language arts for film study; suggestions for use of non-narrative films.

Because the curriculum in a district is much more uniform in each school than it is different, we expected more curricular oriented annotations from district media programs. Responses to Questions 12-14 indicated relatively few districts organize their catalogs on a curricular basis. Question 17 would seem to confirm those responses.

If one makes the assumption that media collections are most "basic" when tied as closely as possible to the curriculum, the inference from the data must be that more media programs violate the assumption than support it.

Media programs are definitely more helpful on controversial materials. Approximately half include cautions on controversial material. The substance of the cautions they include in annotations are as follows:

District	County	Regional
material appropriate for secondary rather than elem., i.e. Night and Fog	item are tagged	not for children
preview suggested	preview before showing	examine violence
not to be used without principal's approval	requires bldg. release form	lists controversy (sex, nudity, V.D., violence)
suggestions for use	restricted grade levels	preview
sex ed. mat'ls restricted	girls/boys only	grade level restrictions
defined by state & county guidelines	in-service only*	cautions in catalog & on item
parental permission	parental consent	"Caution-High-Risk Content"
for superior English only	state code requirements	special section in catalog
	*teacher use only/ mature students only	

Question 18 asked for the sources of annotations. (Table 8) From the responses, we have to assume that many of the annotations "written by staff" are based on distributors' literature and to some extent on the other sources. The distributors' literature is certainly the most convenient source but their descriptions are generally written to appeal to the greatest possible audience. Again, it would seem that curricular purposes are not likely to be best served by relying solely on the distributors' descriptions.

Responses to "other" sources included:

District	County	Regional
AVMC staff with users feedback study guides catalogs of other school systems	teacher's guide ENCOM response on evaluation forms	film preview forms prepared labels Department of Education state coop. catalog program state computer bank consortium

Question 19 asked if annotations are ever reviewed and rewritten. Table 9 summarizes the responses including how such revisions are initiated. Revisions of annotations indicate a sensitivity to making the collection as useful as possible. Doing so takes staff time but the payoff in keeping collections tuned to changing purposes must be worth it. "Other" reasons annotations are reviewed are:

District	County	Regional
when revision occurs to update to reflect changes in reasons for use to shorten description change of curriculum	revised materials	revised films to clarify annotations to update, improve inclusion or exclusion catalogs catalog revision by consortium members

Question 20 asked about the organization of the contents of media catalogs. Table 10 summarizes the data.

Question 21 asked the basis of the subject classification. Table 11 summarizes the data.

Question 22 asked how the subject classification of an individual item is determined, and if any assistance is obtained from any outside source. Table 12 summarizes the data.

Questions 23, 24, 25 asked about the frequency of publication of catalogs and supplements and how clients are informed of new acquisitions between revisions of catalogs and supplements. Table 13 summarizes the data.

Table 10. Catalog Contents

	District		County		Regional	
	Approx. no. of respondents = 65		Approx. no. of respondents = 36		Approx. no. of respondents = 52	
	n	% based on N = 65	n	% based on N = 36	n	% based on N = 52
General Information (policies, how-to-use, etc.)	46	71%	23	64%	28	54%
Ordering Information	54	83%	33	92%	38	73%
Index:						
by title	3	5%	3	8%	10	19%
by subject	58	89%	36	100%	45	87%
by media	5	8%	1	3%	2	4%
by grade level	6	9%			1	2%
by code	1	2%	2	6%	8	15%
Annotated list:						
by title	20	31%	28	78%	38	73%
by subject	19	29%	5	14%	6	12%
by media	4	6%	3	8%	3	6%
by catalog number (call no.)	1	2%				
by code	2	3%				
Equipment Information	6	9%			1	2%
Service Information (including delivery schedules)	6	9%	12	33%	11	21%
Utilization Information	18	28%	14	39%	13	25%
Other:						
professional materials	3	5%			3	6%
index to materials located in other buildings	1	2%				
selection and evaluation procedures	1	2%			1	2%
restricted materials	1	2%	3	8%	2	4%
index by series	1	2%	1	3%	7	13%
abbreviations of producers	3	5%	3	8%	3	6%
index by producer/distributor	2	3%	2	6%	4	8%

Table 10 (cont.)

	District		County		Regional	
	Approx. no. of respondents = 65		Approx. no. of respondents = 36		Approx. no. of respondents = 52	
	n	% based on N = 65	n	% based on N = 36	n	% based on N = 52
media needs-assessment survey	1	2%				
definition of terms			1	3%		
school directory			3	8%		
suggestions for purchase			1	3%		
function of school AV representatives			1	3%		
withdrawals			2	6%		
copyright release information			1	3%	1	2%
new titles			2	6%	1	2%
directory of regional film libraries					1	2%
(SEIMC) special ed. materials center materials					1	2%

Table 11. Subject Classification for Catalog

	Percentage Answering Yes								
	District			County			Regional		
	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item
Basis of subject classification			74			40			57
Library of Congress	4	5%		2	5%		0	0%	
Sears	17	23%		8	20%		15	26%	
NICEM	10	14%		6	15%		6	11%	
locally developed	51	69%		28	70%		38	67%	
other[1]	[1]Dewey Decimal Bowker Film Locator World Information Systems			[1]other centers Dewey Decimal			[1]distributor's lit. Chi-Corporation Education Index Dept. of Ed. state-wide system consortium		

Table 12. Subject Classification Determination

Subject classification determined by:			73			40			54
local media selection prof.	46	32%		26	65%		39	24%	
local cataloger	23	64%		13	33%		13	72%	
both	4	5%		1	2%		2	4%	
With help from:			69			38			54
producer/dist. information	56	81%		33	87%		44	82%	
LC card	15	22%		3	8%		3	6%	
NICEM	21	30%		14	37%		15	28%	
other[2]	[2]Dewey Decimal supervisory staff usage pattern standard catalog local subj. coord. Landers' Film Reviews OCLC EFLA Previews Media & Methods			[2]Dewey Decimal teachers evaluators Sears content spec. HEW "standard terminology" manual local courses of study			[2]other BOCES state data base Dept. of Ed. coop. cataloging Univ. of Ill. film catalog Sears EFLA Landers' Film Reviews curr. specialists Chi Corporation		

Table 13. Catalog Revision and Distribution

	Percentage Answering Yes								
	District			County			Regional		
	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item
Frequency of new edition:			74			42			56
no catalog	2	3%		0	0%		1	2%	
1 year	16	22%		15	36%		4	7%	
2 years	18	24%		10	24%		21	38%	
3-5 years	34	46%		15	36%		28	50%	
6+ years	3	4%		0	0%		0	0%	
Irregular	1	1%		2	5%		2	4%	
Frequency of supplements			73			41			56
no supplement	8	11%		7	17%		2	4%	
1 year	52	71%		25	61%		37	66%	
2 years	7	10%		4	10%		10	18%	
3-5 years	0	0%		0	0%		1	2%	
6+ years	0	0%		0	0%		0	0%	
Irregular	6	8%		5	12%		6	10%	
Announcement of new requisitions			74			39			57
agency newsletter	33	45%		20	51%		29	51%	
notices to teachers	38	51%		25	64%		30	53%	
screenings or display	9	12%		2	5%		6	11%	
via bldg. media profs.	44	60%		16	41%		24	42%	
other[1]	[1]curr. directors superintendent's bulletin supervisors workshops phone recommend. film booking cards			[1]visits to center acquisitions are just prior to supplement			[1]new items sent as substitutes for mat'l that is "out" word of mouth visits to center district coordinators conferences not informed		

Question 26 asked on what basis are catalogs distributed (Table 14). One might expect that districts are more likely to distribute a catalog to each teacher than counties and regionals, but such is not the case. "Some formula" in Table 14 included:

1. One catalog per X number of teachers; most frequently cited -- one per 5 in districts, 2-3 in counties, and 4-5 in regionals.
2. One catalog per X number of schools; most frequently cited -- 3-5 per school in districts, 2-3 in counties, and 2-5 in regionals.

"Other" included:

1. Districts -- all administrators, department heads, all librarians, resource centers, request by teacher, one per grade, based on enrollment, type of school and size.
2. Counties -- request by teacher, media centers, librarians, some parochial schools, department heads. One county distributes one per microfiche reader.
3. Regionals -- school office, faculty room, by request, head teachers, one per grade.
4. Sending a catalog to any office (e. g. nurse) that uses media is a common practice.

Instead of publishing a catalog, one district distributes catalog cards to all school media centers. It would be interesting to see how this system works. Our experience is that teachers prefer working in an office or their classrooms and want a hard copy of the catalog.

Question 27 asked in what form the master catalog information is stored. Table 15 summarizes the data.

Question 28 asked how the catalog text is prepared for publication. Table 16 summarizes the data.

Table 14. Distribution

	Percentage Answering Yes								
	District			County			Regional		
	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item
One catalog per school	5	7%	75	2	5%	42	4	7%	56
One catalog per teacher	32	43%		28	67%		24	43%	
Some formula[1]	22	29%		9	21%		17	30%	
Other	16	21%		3	7%		11	20%	

[1]one catalog per X teachers or X per school.

Table 15. Catalog Preparation

Storage of catalog information			76			41			56
in a book	10	13%		2	5%		6	11%	
on file cards	45	59%		28	68%		24	43%	
in machine readable format	18	24%		6	15%		18	32%	
other[2]	3	4%		6	15%		9	16%	

[2]memory typewriter-cassette tape

Table 16. Prepared for Publication

	District			County			Regional		
	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item
Text prepared for publication by			76			41			57
typing on stencils or mattes	11	14%		6	15%		6	11%	
typing for camera-ready copy	21	28%		5	12%		14	25%	
typing for printer	16	21%		6	15%		9	16%	
computer-generated copy	24	32%		22	53%		28	49%	
other*	6	8%		2	5%				
	*IBM magnetic card typewriter			*IBM magnetic cards					

Table 17. Computer Data Base

Share in computer data base	5	7%	75	10	24%	41	16	28%	57
location of data base and number of participating agencies	TIES PDEC (Harrisburg)-27 Consortium of Univ. Film Centers-50 Region V, MECC/MIS, Mankato, MN-1 State Dept. of Public Instruction, NC-1			Chi Corporation Kent State Univ. Hunterdon Co, NJ-21 Allan Hancock College-3 NICEM			Ulster BOCES Ed'l Service Unit #10, NB-3 Davenport, IA AEA9-5 PA Dept. of Ed.-29 State of Michigan Library-22 Dupage County, San Antonio, TX-5 Consortium of Univ. Film Centers Bowker base		

Question 29 asked if any agencies share a common computer base from which catalogs are generated. Table 17 summarizes the data.

We further asked the identity of the data base and how many agencies belong to it. The following is a list of the data bases reported. The number following the name of the data base is the number of agencies belonging to it. However, because an agency may not know exactly how many other agencies use the same data base, the numbers should be used only as a rough indication of the size of the group.

The economics and convenience of using a common data base are appealing, but if acceptance of a common catalog description and grade designation is part of the bargain, tailoring collections to curricular use may be a casuality.

Section on Controversial Materials

Questions 30 through 33 asked: If higher administrative approval is sought prior to purchase of potentially controversial materials (Table 18); if controversial materials are identified as such in catalogs (Table 19); if separate catalogs or lists are published for certain kinds of materials (Table 20); and if teacher requests for agency-owned controversial materials are subject to approval (Table 21).

Question 34 asked if the agency has a published procedure for handling challenges to collections, and question 35 asked if the agency has had any challenges to items in collections in the last two years. We further asked respondents who had experienced challenges to check the basis for the challenge on a list we provided. Table 22 tabulates the data. Because the numbers are small in the tabulation of bases for challenges, the percentages do not mean much. They are listed simply to provide a rough indication of the probability of an occurrence in each category.

Table 18. Administrative Approval

	Percentage Answering Yes								
	District			County			Regional		
	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item
Administrative approval prior to purchase	34	45%	75	16	41%	39	14	25%	56
from whom?	director of instruc. dir. of elem. ed. assoc. superintendent subject area superv. curriculum coordinator superintendent bldg. principals Board of Trustees State Board of Educ. dept. chairpersons selection committees committees, incl. parents			dir. of elem. & sec. ed. County Board of Ed. chief school officers asst. superintendent county superintendent superintendent's council			regional director asst. superintendent committees of teachers & parents Board of Education Co-op Board of Dir. selection committee school district subj. area supervisor state agency		

Table 19. Catalog Identification

Identification in catalog	35	49%	72	23	55%	42	28	51%	55

Table 20. Separate Catalogs

	Percentage Answering Yes								
	District			County			Regional		
	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item
Separate catalogs or lists	9	12%	75	3	7%	42	1	2%	55
subjects (number after item indicates frequency of mention)	sex education-3 use of drugs-3 violence-1 death-1 family education-1			health education-4 science-2 use of drugs-2			sex education-2		

Table 21. Approval of Teacher Requests

Teacher requests subject to approval	34	48%	71	13	32%	40	7	13%	53
subjects	sex education-16 use of drugs-4 violence-1 death-1 English-4 health-6 racial/ethnic stereotyping-1 moral standard-3 child abuse, marriage-4 religion			sex education-6 health education-4 use of drugs-1 English-1 family life-5			sex education-10		
by whom?	program director dir. of AV services dir. of instruction subj. supervisor curriculum office administrators building nurse building principal dept. chairperson Board of Education teacher committees parents			building principals asst. superintendent Board of Education subj. supervisor local district admin.			local school admin. special committee principal advisory board film librarian		

Table 22. Challenges to Collections

	Percentage Answering Yes								
	District			County			Regional		
	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item	n	%	n responses to item
Published policy	41	57%	72	22	52%	42	23	43%	54
Challenges within last 2 years	27	38%	72	11	26%	42	20	36%	55
	Of 27 agencies challenged:			Of 11 agencies challenged:			Of 20 agencies challenged:		
sex education	10	37%		5	46%		9	45%	
religious beliefs	12	44%		2	18%		7	35%	
separation church/state	3	11%		0	0		0	0	
creation/evolution	7	26%		2	18%		3	15%	
unpatriotic	4	15%		4	36%		2	10%	
witchcraft	1	4%		0	0		1	5%	
vulgar/profane language	5	19%		0	0		3	15%	
sexually explicit	5	19%		1	9%		5	25%	
use of drugs	0	0		0	0		2	10%	
use of alcohol	0	0		0	0		1	5%	
factual errors	3	11%		2	18%		1	5%	
violence	11	41%		1	9%		5	25%	
abortion	0	0		0	0		2	10%	
moral standards	6	22%		2	18%		6	30%	
racial/ethnic stereotyping	6	22%		0	0		3	15%	
sex stereotyping	2	7%		2	18%		1	5%	
other	4	15%		2	18%		6	30%	

It is interesting to note that although districts and regionals are equally likely to have challenges, a higher percentage of districts have published policies. We are surprised that only approximately half of all agencies had published policies, particularly in view of the tremendous amount of publicity given to censorship problems recently. We deliberately used the past tense (had) in the last sentence because we assume (and hope!) that the number with published policies has increased since the survey went out. This summer (June 23-27) we at Indiana University will be offering a workshop on "Coping with Censorship." One of the main objectives of the workshop is to help participants study and develop policies and practices that will help them deal with censorship problems.

Based on the responses, challenges are either extremely random and primarily by local groups, or our sample was not large enough to detect a pattern. We wish now we had asked if challenges were locally inspired or as a result of efforts by an organized state-wide or national group. We will probably return to this problem in a couple of years.

Finally, we asked the agencies who had experienced challenges to list the specific items Table 23 lists the specific item with frequency of mention. We did not exclude books from mention although we had non-print media in mind. Had we encouraged mention of books, we probably would have received more book titles. The Lottery was obviously the most frequently cited -- and the target of concerted attack due to being vulnerable not only because of violence but also because the filmed version can be interpreted as unpatriotic and an attack on moral standards (check Table 22 for frequency of each of those categories). We say filmed version because the locale and historical time in which the original short story takes place is ambiguous. The decision by EBE to film the story in a contemporary

Table 23. Frequency of Challenged Items

(#35 on The Second Survey)

Books:	
Abortion	1
Baker's Wife	1
Forgotten Door	1
Future City	1
Hentoff: This School is Driving Me Crazy	1
Slaughter House Five	1
Wicked Witches of Salem	1
8mm Loop Films:	
Liberation of a Nazi Concentration Camp	1
Sound Filmstrips:	
A Child is Born	1
Learning about Sex	1
Transparencies:	
3M Family Life Units	1
Filmstrips:	
World History - Stone Ages	1
16mm Films:	
The Lottery	14
Future Shock	4
Boys Aware	2
Incredible Bread Machine	2
Say Goodbye	2
The Lottery, a Discussion	2
A Baby is Born	1
A Christmas Rhapsody	1
Adolf Hitler	1
Animals are Crying	1
Between Two Lives	1
Big Boys Don't Cry	1
Bill Cosby on Prejudice	1
Bill of Rights in Action: Freedom of Religion	1
Birth Control, the Choices	1
Birth of a Nation	1
Black & White Uptight	1
Boarded Window	1
Bushmen of the Kalahari	1
16mm Films (cont.):	
Chicago: A Midland Metropolis	1
Christmas Deer	1
Christmas Through the Ages	1
Claude	1
Crying Red Giant	1
Cuba & Fidel	1
Energy Zoo	1
Far Cry from Yesterday	1
Fertilization & Birth	1
Friendly Beasts	1
Girls Aware	1
How to Say No to a Rapist	1
I Am also a You	1
In Cold Blood	1
Last Chance Farmer	1
Last Whalers	1
Littlest Angel	1
Love Is a Planned Family	1
Love to Kill	1
Macbeth	1
Make Mine Metric	1
Man: A Course of Study Series	1
Man the Incredible Machine	1
Meaning of Modern Painting	1
Mom, Why Won't You Listen	1
Mystery of Time	1
One Friday	1
Pecos Bill	1
Phoebe: Story of a Teenage Pregnancy	1
Right to Live - Who Decides	1
Self Breast Examination	1
Selfish Giant	1
Sixty Second Spot: Making of a TV Commercial	1
Step & Fetchit	1
Icarus & Daedalus	1
The Hat, Is this War Necessary	1
Twelve Days of Christmas	1
Two Hundred Candles	1
Universe	1
VD: The Gift that Keeps on Giving	1
What Color Are You	1
Why Man Creates	1
Witches of Salem	2
You & Your Five Senses	1

U. S. setting brought on the objections. Had EBE placed the setting in Salem or in a "foreign" country, the film would not have been the subject of such a broad attack. But it now is patently American. It should go without saying that we are not excusing or condoning censorship, but, rather, analyzing why the film is challenged so frequently.

We have been asked a number of times why Future Shock had the dubious honor of coming in a weak second. (The homosexual "marriage" is probably the major reason.)

In both cases, we also wonder if use of both films at inappropriate grade levels may have accounted for some objections.

We hasten to add that injudicious use of films probably accounts for a number of objections -- sometimes encouraged by descriptions wide of the mark (e. g. Big Boys Don't Cry, which is clearly a film for adult groups; The Hunter treats the same theme in a way that comes across very well with 10-13 year-old children).

Table 24 recasts Table 23 into geographic regions. This form of presenting the data helps put the problem in a certain perspective, e. g. the three Christmas films in Connecticut.

We have taken out the zipcodes. A double space between listings in a state serves to indicate a report from a different agency.

Table 24. Geographic Distribution of Challenges

Northeastern

Connecticut:

Christmas Through the Ages
A Christmas Rhapsody
Twelve Days of Christmas

New Hampshire:

Future Shock

New York:

Icarus and Daedalus
Adolf Hitler

Birth of a Nation

Middle Atlantic

Delaware:

How to Say No to a Rapist
Self Breast Examination
Incredible Bread Machine

VD: The Gift that Keeps on Giving
Future Shock
Sixty Second Spot: Making of a TV Commercial
Bill of Rights in Action: Freedom of Religion

Maryland:

The Lottery
The Right to Live - Who Decides

Wicked Witches of Salem

Pecos Bill

West Virginia:

Meaning of Modern Painting

Southeastern

Florida:

Hentoff: This School is Driving Me Crazy

South Carolina:

Two Hundred Candles
Energy 2000

Mid West

Illinois:

Bushmen of the Kalahari
Man the Incredible Machine
Chicago: A Midland Metropolis
Fertilization & Birth
World History - Stone Ages
Boarded Window

Big Boys Don't Cry

Indiana:

Last Chance Farmer
Last Whalers

Iowa:

Incredible Bread Machine

Future City
Wicked Witches of Salem

Michigan:

The Lottery
Love to Kill

Minnesota:

Mystery of Time

Forgotten Door
Between Two Lives
Black & White Uptight
What Color Are You

Missouri:

The Lottery

Nebraska:

The Lottery
Step & Fetchit
In Cold Blood
Macbeth

The Lottery
Say Goodbye

Ohio:

The Lottery

Rocky Mountain

Colorado:

Make Mine Metric

Learning about Sex
Animals Are Crying
Claude
Mom, Why Won't You Listen
A Child is Born
The Lottery
The Lottery, a Discussion
The Hat, Is this War Necessary

The Lottery

Nevada:

Littlest Angel
Christmas Deer
Friendly Beasts

Southwest

Arizona:

A Baby is Born
Birth Control, the Choices
Bill Cosby on Prejudice

Texas:

Liberation of a Nazi
Concentration Camp

The Lottery

Future Shock
The Lottery

I Am also a You

The Lottery
Future Shock
Wicked Witches of Salem
Phoebe: Story of a Teenage
Pregnancy
Why Man Creates
You & Your Five Senses
Love Is a Planned Family

Far West

California:

Boys Aware

Cuba & Fidel
Universe
Say Goodbye

Boys Aware
Girls Aware

Selfish Giant

The Lottery

The Lottery

Crying Red Giant

Oregon:

Far Cry from Yesterday

Washington:

Slaughter House Five
Abortion
Baker's Wife

The Lottery
The Lottery, a Discussion
One Friday